



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/606,006 | 06/25/2003 | Daris L. Dotson | 5424A | 5732 |
| 7590 | 01/29/2004 | | | |
| Terry T. Moyer P.O. Box 1927 Spartanburg, SC 29304 | | | EXAMINER CHEUNG, WILLIAM K | |
| | | | ART UNIT 1713 | PAPER NUMBER |
| DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|------------------|------------------|
| 10/608,006 | DOTSON, DARIN L. |
| William K Cheung | 1713 |

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2003.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 0811.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/121,224. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (US 5,891,940).

The invention of claim 1 relates to a method for nucleating syndiotactic polypropylene comprising the steps of:

- a) *providing a thermoplastic formulation comprising syndiotactic propylene;*
- b) *introducing at least one nucleating agent therein, wherein said at least one nucleating agent exhibits nucleation properties within syndiotactic polypropylene such that it introduces a crystallization temperature of at least 71 °C for a thermoplastic formulation comprising from 70-75% by weight of syndiotactic polypropylene, when analyzed under a modified ASTM Test Method D-794-85 wherein the cooling rate is 20 °C/min; and*
- c) *allowing the resultant formulation of step b) to cool.*

Chen et al. (col. 5, line 40-64) disclose a method for nucleating syndiotactic polypropylene where the formulation is prepared by mixing in a Henschel mixer and passing through an extruder for pelletization to obtain a syndiotactic polypropylene resin composition. Because using an extruder for pelletization includes the mixing the additive, melting, and cooling the propylene polymer, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the claimed step a), and c) are inherently possessed by the disclosed process of Chen et al. Further, Chen et al. (col. 7, Table 1) in examples 4, 6, 7, 8, and comparative examples 2, 3 clearly indicates syndiotactic polypropylene formulations having a crystallization temperature of at least 72 °C. Although the crystallization temperatures are measured at a different cooling rate, the examiner believes that such minor difference in cooling rate would not impact significantly on the measured crystallization temperature results in view of plus and minus 5 degree errors which is inherent to the instrumentation employed. Therefore, in view of the substantially identical syndiotactic polypropylene used in the formulations and substantially identical crystallization temperature properties between the formulations of Chen et al. and the formulations of claim 1, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the claimed 70-75% by weight of syndiotactic polypropylene is inherently possessed by Chen et al. In view of the reasons set forth above, it would not be difficult for one of ordinary skill in art to use the process teachings in Chen et al. to obtain the process invention of claim 1. Claim 1 is anticipated.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K Cheung whose telephone number (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5885.

Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1300.



William K. Cheung

Patent Examiner

January 19, 2004